UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/098,366	06/17/1998	NOBUYA HIGASHIYAMA	13237-2150	4032

7590   12/11/2001

M TODD MITCHEN
MERXHANT & GOULD
P O BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN   55402-0903

EXAMINER
BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ___3___ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Oct 3, 2001*

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-21* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideratio

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-21* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requiremen

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Box CPA, and Response to Office Action (hereinafter "the Response"), both filed on 10/3/2001 to the original application filed on **6/17/1998**.

2.   The rejection of claims 1, 3-6, 10-15, 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter and Fukunaga has been withdrawn as necessitated by the Response.

3.   The rejection of claims 7-9, 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter, Fukunaga, and Gipson has been withdrawn as necessitated by Applicant's 35 U.S.C. 103© declaration on page 5 of the Response (paper #18).

4.   Claims 1, 3-21 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 10, 15, 21 are independent claims.

Continued Prosecution Application

5.   The request filed on 10/3/2001 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/098,366 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 1, 3-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van De Vanter, U.S. Patent No. 5,857,212 issued January 1999, in view of Fukunaga, U.S. Patent No. 5,627,948 issued May 1997.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim **1(a)** *"determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text, wherein the existing text includes existing paragraph marks, existing characters or existing spaces"*).

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with amended claim **1(b)** *"collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text"*).

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with amended claim **1(b)** *"otherwise, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with amended claim 1© "*selecting one of a plurality of rules based on the collected context information*").

Van De Vanter teaches changing cursor presentation (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67; compare with amended claim **1(d)** "*in response to selecting the rule, changing a presentation of the cursor to indicate an anticipated location of the insertion point...*"). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach indication of formatting types in close proximity. However, Fukunaga teaches display of formatting information proximate to cursor location, subsequent to a change in said cursor location (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim **1(d)** "*...and a type of formatting that will be applied to text and objects located in close proximity to the cursor location*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches the use of cursor movement and placement management (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim **1(e)** "*determining whether an indication has been received to place the insertion point in the electronic document*").

Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby a cursor is positioned in a displayed program for editing purposes (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 58-63). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach performing formatting. However, Fukunaga teaches performing formatting relative to cursor placement (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim **1(f)** "*if so, then performing formatting to place the insertion point in the electronic document*"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of

format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

In regard to dependent claim 3, Van De Vanter teaches various types of mouse clicks that can be used in the embodiment of the invention as disclosed by Van De Vanter (Van De Vanter column 9 lines 42-44; compare with claim 3).

In regard to dependent claim 4, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach the repeating of steps 1(a) - 1(f) of amended claim 1 upon no indication of cursor placement. However, Van De Vanter teaches repeating the visual offset calculation of alignment markers (Van De Vanter abstract at bottom, also column 42 lines 54-57; compare with claim 4). Claim 4 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because of Van De Vanter's taught advantage of repetition, providing a way to display a complete formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach a method of formatting comprising the addition/deletion of document formatting properties. However, Fukunaga teaches the changing of format properties (Fukunaga Figures 3, 4, also column 4 lines 8-10; compare with amended claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of Fukunaga to the method of Van De Vanter, because of Fukunaga's taught advantage of format changing, providing increased textual correctness to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 6, Van De Vanter teaches localized lexical analysis performed subsequent to an insertion point defining a position of user editing, said position indicated by a cursor over text (Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-33, column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim 6).

In regard to dependent claims 7-8, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach associating a rule with formatting steps, as well as matching context information with a trigger, and selecting a coinciding rule. However, these limitations would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because Van De Vanter teaches how a keystroke executive and a tokenizer respond to a "delete net character" command issued by a user (Van De Vanter column 25 lines 44-50, and Table 6, 7). Certain positional rules are selected and implemented which are dependent upon a cursor position, which suggests triggering events and formatting steps eventually resulting in a final position (compare with claims 7-8), providing the advantage of rules based triggered events for modifying position displays.

In regard to dependent claim 9, a computer-readable medium (ie. diskette, hard disk, etc.) is known in the software art.

In regard to independent claim 10, Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim 10(a) *"determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text, wherein the existing text includes existing paragraph marks, existing characters or existing spaces"*).

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with amended claim 10(b) *"collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text"*).

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with amended claim 10(b) *"otherwise, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with amended claim 10© *"applying the collected context information..."*, and *" ...to determine whether the collected information coincides with one of the plurality of rules"*). Van De Vanter also teaches the use of a database for storing lexical rules (see Van De Vanter column 11 lines 54-57; compare with amended claim 10© *"...to a database of a plurality of rules..."*).

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of cursor selection and display based upon insertion point position resulting in different editing behaviors and cursor presentations (Van De Vanter column 36

lines 59-67, column 37 lines 1-2; compare with amended claim **10(d)** "*if so, then determining one of a plurality of cursors associated with the coinciding rule*", and **10(e)** "*displaying the associated cursor*").

In regard to dependent claim 11, Van De Vanter teaches the presentation of an I-beam cursor based upon the position of an insertion point in the document (Van De Vanter column 37 lines 19-24; compare with claim 11).

In regard to dependent claim 12, Van De Vanter teaches a method of alignment markers placed around tokens for centering lines, and automatic aligning between lines (Van De Vanter column 39 lines 9-23; compare with claim 12).

In regard to dependent claim 13, Van De Vanter does not specifically teach the repeating of steps 10(a) - 10(e) of amended claim 10 upon movement of cursor placement. However, Van De Vanter teaches repeating the visual offset calculation of alignment markers (Van De Vanter abstract at bottom, also column 42 lines 54-57; compare with claim 13). Claim 13 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because of Van De Vanter's taught advantage of repetition, providing a way to display a complete formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claim 14, claim 14 reflects the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for implementing the methods as claimed in claim 13, and is rejected using the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 15, Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim **15(a)** *"determining whether a location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over existing text, wherein the existing text includes existing paragraph marks, existing characters or existing spaces"*).

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with amended claim **15(b)** *"collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by: if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text"*).

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location. However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare with amended claim **15(b)** *"otherwise, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor"*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with amended claim 15© *"applying the collected context information..."*, and *" ...to determine whether the collected information coincides with one of the plurality of rules"*). Van De Vanter also teaches the use of a database for storing lexical rules

(Van De Vanter column 11 lines 54-57; compare with amended claim **15©** "...*to a database of a plurality of rules...*").

In addition, Van De Vanter teaches a method of matching an I-beam cursor relevant to various insertion point positions (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 64-67, column 37 lines 1-3; compare with amended claim **15(d)** "*if so, then adjusting the location of the insertion point based upon the coinciding rule*", and **15(e)** "*determining whether the location of the insertion point matches the location of the cursor*").

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach the repeating of steps 15(a) - 15(e). However, Van De Vanter teaches repeating the visual offset calculation of subsequent alignment markers (Van De Vanter abstract at bottom, also column 42 lines 54-57; compare with amended claim **15(f)** "*if not, then repeating steps (a) - (e)*"). Claim **15(f)** would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Van De Vanter, because of Van De Vanter's taught advantage of repetition, providing a way to display a complete formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

In regard to dependent claims 16, claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 17-18, Van De Vanter teaches an embodiment involving secondary memory (Van De Vanter column 8 lines 25-29; compare with claim 17). A computer-readable medium (ie. diskette, hard disk, etc.) is known in the software art (compare with claim 18).

In regard to dependent claim 19, Van De Vanter teaches a method of a token stream, whereby

dynamic user input results in updating insertion points and cursor positions of each dynamic editing action

which can be used with a mouse (Van De Vanter column 4 lines 25-35, column 9 lines 42-44; compare with

claim 19).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Van De Vanter teaches a method of an insertion point defining an

actual editing location, said cursor location and analysis is updated subsequent to a user edit (Van De Vanter

column 4 lines 25-35; compare with claim 20).

In regard to independent claim 21, Van De Vanter teaches a location of a cursor over existing text

(Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67; compare with amended claim **21(a)** *"determining whether a*

location of a cursor in the electronic document is positioned over an existing line").

Van De Vanter teaches text editing by managing movement and placement of a cursor relative to text

positions (Van De Vanter column 21 lines 65-67, column 12 lines 22-29; compare with amended claim

21(b) *"collecting context information regarding the location of the cursor in the electronic document by:*

if the location of the cursor is positioned over an existing line, then collecting context information

associated with the existing line").

Van De Vanter does not specifically teach collecting said information proximate to cursor location.

However, Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor

position not located over text (Fukunaga Figure 4, also column 3 lines 64-67, column 4 lines 1-10; compare

with amended claim **21(b)** *"otherwise, collecting context information associated with an existing line that*

is proximate to the location of the cursor"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of

collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De

Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches a rule selected from a plurality of rules subsequent to user input (Van De

Vanter column 16 lines 65-67, column 17 lines 1-5; compare with amended claim **21©** *"selecting one of a*

plurality of rules based on the collected context information").

Van De Vanter teaches changing cursor presentation (Van De Vanter column 36 lines 59-67;

compare with amended claim **21(d)** *"in response to selecting the rule, changing a presentation of the*

cursor to indicate an anticipated location of the insertion point..."). Van De Vanter does not specifically

teach indication of formatting types in close proximity. However, Fukunaga teaches display of formatting

information proximate to cursor location, subsequent to a change in said cursor location (Fukunaga Figures 3,

4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim **21(d)** *"...and a type of formatting that will be applied to text and*

objects located in close proximity to the cursor location"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught

advantage of format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De

Vanter (Fukunaga column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Van De Vanter teaches the use of cursor movement and placement management (Van De Vanter

column 12 lines 22-29; compare with claim **21(e)** *"determining whether an indication has been received to*

place the insertion point in the electronic document").

Van De Vanter teaches a method whereby a cursor is positioned in a displayed program for editing

purposes (Van De Vanter column 12 lines 58-63). Van De Vanter does not specifically teach performing

formatting. However, Fukunaga teaches performing formatting relative to cursor placement (Fukunaga

Figures 3, 4 items K, 301-307; compare with claim **21(f)** "*if so, then performing formatting to place the*

insertion point in the electronic document"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of

format change and display, providing a way to easily show formatting changes to Van De Vanter (Fukunaga

column 1 lines 66-67, column 2 lines 1-2).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicants arguments specifically regarding claims 7-9, 16-18 are moot in view of the new round of

rejections. Applicant's arguments filed 10/3/2001 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 2 of the Response that Van De Vanter does not describe determining

whether a location of a cursor is positioned over existing text because Van De Vanter only permits a cursor to

be positioned over existing elements. The Examiner notes that Van De Vanter teaches determination of token

streams, and it is clear that said token streams comprise textual elements as shown in Van De Vanter, column

22 Table 3. In addition, even if one were to interpret Van De Vanter as only permitting an insertion point to

be positioned over existing elements, this would imply that Van De Vanter's system has made a

determination in support of the above.

Applicant argues on page 2 of the Response that Van De Vanter discusses an insertion point, as

opposed to Applicant's claimed limitations which recite a cursor and in insertion point. The Examiner notes

that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a

mouse cursor as a pointing cursor, as well as an input cursor. A mouse cursor within a Windows text editor

environment plays an integral part in the insertion process because it defines the position (via mouse control)

of text input. In addition, it is commonly known that a mouse cursor will change shape from an arrow to an I-beam when placed over text areas, said cursor defining placement of insertion subsequent to a left mouse click (ie. WordPerfect, or Word in a Windows environment).

Applicant argues on pages 2-3 of the Response that claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a cursor can be positioned in a location that is not over existing paragraph marks, existing characters, or existing spaces. The Examiner notes that claim 1 limitation (a) claims in part, "...wherein the existing text includes paragraph marks, existing characters, or existing spaces. When one skilled in the art encounters existing text of a displayed document in a text editor environment, it is obvious that said text includes one of the above mentioned items. The Examiner notes that Fukunaga shows a "line return" indicative of a line with no existing text (Fukunaga Figure 4 item 307, also column 3 lines 51-53). This is indicative of blank lines or paragraphs (paragraph marks with no existing text) to which a cursor is placed. To preserve page layout presentation of a document, information regarding blank lines or paragraphs are recorded relative to the existence and position of existing text as presently claimed. In this way, Fukunaga teaches areas (in a word processor environment) both with and without existing text, and it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for context associations between said areas to exist in order to preserve page layout presentation.

Applicant argues on page 2-3 of the Response that Fukunaga does not teach collecting context information, and that there is no motivation to combine references. The Examiner notes that Fukunaga teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text, and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Fukunaga to Van De Vanter, because Fukunaga's taught advantage of collecting format information, providing a way to establish format and display correspondence to Van De Vanter. Van De Vanter teaches changing cursor presentation shapes.

Applicant argues on page 4 of the Response that Van De Vanter does not teach the repeating steps of

the independent claims. The Examiner notes that Van De Vanter teaching of repeating the visual offset

calculation of alignment markers suggests repetition of operations, providing a way to display a complete

formatting change to the method as taught by Van De Vanter.

Applicant argues on page 4-5 of the Response that the cited art does not teach the limitations of

claims 5, 6, and 12. The Examiner notes that Fukunaga teaches the changing of format properties, and Van

De Vanter teaches localized lexical analysis performed subsequent to an insertion point defining a position of

user editing, said position indicated by a cursor over text. Van De Vanter also teaches alignment markers

placed around tokens for centering lines, as well as automatic alignment between lines

Conclusion

9.   **Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to disclosure.**

Dinkelacker   U.S. Patent No. 6,092,068   issued   07/2000

10.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to William Bashore whose telephone number is **(703) 308-5807.** The examiner can

normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather

Herndon, can be reached on **(703) 308-5186.**

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the

Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900.**

11.   **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)
or:
(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or:
(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).**

William L. Bashore
12/6/2001

JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER